

religious and political position, and indicate the exact character of his mental development at the corresponding periods of his annals. Nations have written the records of their history in stone. The temples, the palaces, the monuments of Germany, France, and England are so many petrified poems. The Vatican, the Escurial, the Alhambra, each unfold to us more than many volumes could have done, of all that is interesting to man, of all those absorbing and fascinating subjects on which we would question the past. Catholicism has written its history, and more than is ordinarily understood by history, in the monasteries, cathedrals, and monuments of the middle ages; and, whatever be its subsequent fate, the memory, at least, of its worship will need no other shrine. Liberty, commerce, and industry have recorded their enterprise, also, in the same characters. And the monuments of municipal greatness are not among the least of the trophies and achievements of architecture. Ambition has imbodied its yearnings and its triumphs in pyramids, columns, obelisks, triumphal arches; humanity in hospitals, and schools, and institutions of benevolence; and science in railroads, tunnels, aqueducts, and bridges. The edifices of England are so many chapters of our history. The genius of a nation, as well as of the architect, is stamped upon such relics.

We have seen that art is one in its origin,—that its waters, however diversified their channel, flow from one fountain, and its glories, however differing in hue, are reflections of one infinite brightness: may we not go further, and observe that art is one in its real nature and object? In the infinity of beauty and of truth, pervading this mighty universe of matter and of mind, lie the inspirations of art; and it is from his fresher, deeper insight into this inexhaustible life, that genius derives his power, and his productions their value. No matter what his tools, whether colours, or marble, or stone, or sounding pipes and strings, or cadenced words, his work is the same; his eye has looked through and beyond the horizon of his time; his ear has listened, through the discords of the present, to the harmonies of the future; his thought has pierced, through the crust of the surface, to the deep beneath; and now the time is come; he has seen,—he must show; he has heard,—he must tell; he has received,—he must give; in picture, or statue, or structure, or symphony, or poem, he imbodifies his results; and in all these various forms of production, whatever be the character of their design, the aim of the earnest-souled producer, and the requirement of the earnest-souled receiver, is one;—that the thing produced shall be beautiful and true.

As the artist's work is similar, so is its purpose. Like the mountain stream, which, descending from the clouds of heaven, seeks, with a widening current, the boundless ocean whence its waters first exhaled, the true artist ever strives after that whole infinity of beauty and of truth, from a detached ray, as it were, of which his course of inspired action began. In the beginning of his career there was an extension of the infinite to him,—a revelation to his spirit of a beauty and a truth, newer in kind, or higher in degree, than was before known or felt: from this his labours sprang; and the true tendency and end of them is to make what he thus knows and feels, known and felt; to open to his own and all others' eyes a wider and more perfect view of that glory which has glanced upon him; and in proportion as he has fulfilled this shall his work endure. But this is not all:—

The ruling principles also of the several arts are identical: in the expression of the same quality or feeling, the same law of means obtains in all the arts, i. e. the elements must be used after the same principles, and therefore the laws of the fine arts are deducible from the principles of art, and may be considered as a *polyglot version* of art-law. If, therefore, we obtain a comprehensive knowledge of the principles and laws of art, we possess the keys to the intelligence and application of the laws of the arts, which are its different branches. The aim of art, in all its branches, throughout its works, is, from variety of element, by harmony of combination and arrangement, to produce unity of effect; in fewer words, variety in unity.

It would free an artist from the pedantry—

from the trammels of the technical, to acquire some knowledge of the arts which thus claim kindred with his own; and where there is original power, the mind, instead of being oppressed by its increase of attainments, will discover, or discern, more clearly, the common bearings and hidden analogies of the different branches of art, which will thus shed light upon each other. An architect, for instance, would be a better architect from knowing something of painting and sculpture,—while the painter and sculptor would find their advantage in an acquaintance with architecture—the principles of the three arts being the same, only differently applied. The architect need not be able to paint a picture, or model a bust,—nor the sculptor or painter to design a mansion; but each should understand the great principles of the sister arts, and know how, or in what way, they are identical with those of his own, and be able to trace the analogy and relations of the various productions of genius. He does not thoroughly understand the principles of his own art, unless he see their universal application. A study of the laws of art, generally, would not enable the same man to write an epic, compose an overture, and design a palace, but it would be attended with advantages sufficiently important in reference to the art to which he was devoted. It would lead him to see at a glance to which of the arts any given subject was best fitted, and prevent a painter taking one that was more suited, or perhaps only suited, to a poem; or a sculptor attempting to illustrate, by his chisel, one that required the superior resources of painting to express. Many failures have had their source in ignorance or inattention on this head. There are necessary limitations to each of the arts: their scope is various. Painting is more confined than poetry, and sculpture than either. Of the five several arts, poetry is the most excellent—the most comprehensive: the poet has the longest line, the widest range. Ideas can be expressed in poetry that cannot be adequately expressed otherwise,—by any other of the arts.\*

#### SOME SUGGESTIONS FOR ARRANGING AND COLOURING THE INTERIOR OF THE BUILDING IN HYDE PARK.

MANY persons must have heard with surprise of the enormous quantity of space required by comparatively so few a number as 8,700 exhibitors, and many more will, no doubt, feel grieved at the number of interesting objects that must necessarily be rejected for want of room. It is said that about 400,000 square feet of floor and counter space have been asked for, while there are in the building but about 200,000 square feet available; one-half, therefore, only of the intended exhibitors can be accommodated, or one-half of the articles sent in must be returned, and thus many industrious individuals disappointed. It has consequently been determined to form an additional gallery, and thus to give an increased space for about 40,000 feet—but a trifling sum towards the 200,000 additional feet asked for.

The object of this communication is to suggest one or two things which may be found useful. First, as to the *floor space*. In very many cases it may easily be doubled, by placing, about 4 feet or 4 feet 6 in. above it, a counter or table for other objects to rest on. This height is about that of an ordinary mantel-piece, would be low enough for anything to be viewed with ease on it, and would at the same time be sufficiently high to enable the spectator to have a full view of all objects underneath. By this means a vast additional space would be obtained at but a trifling cost.

I would here remark that all *architectural and engineering models* should be so placed that the eye of the spectator be on a level with the horizon line, and so that he may stand and view it as he would do the actual building. The tables, as proposed, might be especially reserved for all such models as buildings, bridges, docks, &c., always, as I have said, providing a true eye level. We should be able to look along the surface of a dock or line of railway; but it can hardly be considered desirable to look down on the roof of a church and see nothing but the gilt cock.

As to *counter-space*—this may also be in nearly all cases doubled, by forming each counter like a roof with inclined sides meeting in the centre, both forming an angle of not less than 45 degrees, or even a more acute angle might in many instances be adopted. Fillets would, of course, be nailed at various distances apart all along each inclined side, to keep the things exhibited in their places. In

many respects this would be found better than a flat table, particularly where the spectators are likely to crowd on each other, and consequently, to lean over it; besides which, most objects are better seen on an inclined desk than on a flat space. No fear need be felt that any object will be in shadow, for shadows there can be none, where the whole roof is one uninterrupted surface of light.

One would have thought that some slight shadow in some part of the building, produced by the admission of uninterrupted light, would have been an advantage, as the beauty of a thing depends almost as much upon the shadows it casts, and its consequent relief, as upon its intrinsic merits. All architectural models, gems, gold and silver work, require pure light for their full effect. Surely the matchless jewel, the Koh-i-noor, should burn in a sun-beam.

And as to the structure itself, the effect that would have been produced by the sun's rays coming in through the southern side, will be lost by the intention there is of filling it up with close boarding: this should not be, as the great length of the building renders some such addition to the perspective needful. Probably, the finest effect of sunlight in this country, in an interior, is—or rather should be—seen on a bright day in St. Paul's, the light coming in in long rays through the windows under the dome. This fine effect is unfortunately but rarely seen, as the windows are painted over, this painting stopping the light and thus enabling visitors to see the dome. It is, therefore, only on rare occasions, and when the windows are opened, that the magnificent effect is seen. This comparison will enable us to judge of the additional interest the admission of pure light in some portions of the building, and through the southern side, would give it.

It has been stated by the commissioners that the wall space is not to be considered as merely a space for hanging things from, but is to be fitted with shelves: if so, I would suggest that these shelves should incline downwards towards the spectator, as all objects on them will be thus much more easily inspected than if the shelves were on a level, and another advantage would be, that a greater number of shelves could be made available. As there appears, too, to have been so slight a demand for wall space, would it not be a good plan to devote the whole of it, not demanded, to raw materials, specimens of minerals, and rare woods; the higher shelves to hermetically sealed bottles, preserved meats, and other such articles?

Another point of no slight importance is the best and most effective way of exhibiting to advantage the quality, texture, and colour of rich silks and velvets; it is to hang them in *folds*, as they hang naturally in a dress, and not, as they do at the "Society's rooms," plaster the place with them in great flat patches, some three or four feet square. This mode of hanging them in folds will be found to double the beauty of the stuff, as there is then, in addition to the quality, texture, and colour of the silk, *light and shade*. It will too, as is obvious, save above two-thirds of the space. A Cashmere shawl on a lady's shoulder is a beautiful and graceful ornament, but plastered to a wall is as uninteresting as a piece of oilcloth.

You must allow me to add a word on the specimen of colouring put upon the building. How Mr. Jones could have done this is indeed surprising. But let us compare the first two coloured plates of the second volume of Mr. Jones's own magnificent work with the two last plates; and if we can learn nothing from such comparison, we are incompetent to judge, and our case is indeed hopeless. The colour of the Alhambra is almost worthy of Nature herself. In some parts it is absolutely faultless. In Egypt there are vaster surfaces, and in India richer and deeper colours; but nowhere has the pencil of the decorative artist been used with such judgment, and with such magic skill, as in this enchanted palace. Can nothing be learned from it?

I would here humbly suggest to the attention of the commissioners a mode of colouring the interior of the great building, and which would at least have the claim of *novelty and ease of execution*.

The system I propose is shortly this. To paint the whole of the iron-supporting columns in *pure white* throughout the building; and then each aisle throughout its whole length one *uniform colour*, commencing in the centre avenue with yellow (yellow being the central and brightest colour of the spectrum); the aisles or avenues on the one side being then in *orange, red, and purple*, and those on the other side *green, blue, and violet*: thus seven of the aisles, including the central avenue, would make up together the colours of the solar spectrum, and be arranged in the same order—this system being of course continued throughout the building to the lateral walls. No coarseness or glare would result from such an arrangement in so large a space. As (to view it in detail) the centre aisles, looked at separately, would have the same effect as a room covered with yellow paper, so likewise the next in order, the orange, the next purple, and so on. Each avenue by itself would have a simple and beautiful effect; as all single uniformly coloured spaces

\* To be continued.